

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2008, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the above amendments and consider the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 have been amended to more clearly describe exemplary embodiments of the invention and remain pending in the application. The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and accompanying remarks.

#### **Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment**

The Examiner asserted that the previous amendment was non-responsive and withdrew the claims. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended the claims to distinguish the rail component from a gasket as described by Nakao, which the Applicant respectfully submits is non-analogous art. In light of the amendments, the Applicant will readdress the rejections from the previous office action.

#### **Rejection Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Examiner has rejected Applicant's claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, asserting that Applicant fails to comply with the written description requirement by claiming subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As seen in Figure 3 and described in at least paragraph [0017], the specification clearly contains disclosure pertaining to a rail component comprising a metal substrate. Likewise, paragraph [0017] clearly contains language pertaining to a "rail component." In order to clarify the intended subject matter of the present claims, the Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 to more clearly describe the subject matter recited therein. As a result of these amendments, Applicant believes it is now clear that a rail component is being claimed and that the Applicant had possession of the claimed invention. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is now moot.

The Examiner also rejected Applicant's claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, asserting that the claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner asserted that the term "rail component" is unclear and renders claims 1, 9, and 14 vague and indefinite. As mentioned in the above argument, the Applicant believes that the term "rail component" is definite from the express language contained in at least paragraph [0017] of the specification and as shown in Figure 3. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is now moot.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakao (US 5,443,887). Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5-16,

and 18-22 to more clearly describe the subject matter recited therein. As Applicant does not believe Nakao to teach the subject matter of the rejected claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

One skilled in the art would not recognize any relationship between a rail component and a gasket. In fact, Nakao does not provide any motivation that a rail component could be successfully made based on the description of a gasket with limited dimensions as described by Nakao (e.g., 1.5 mm thick in Examples 13-20 and 0.5 mm thick in Examples 21 and 22). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Nakao does not provide any support for the rejection.

The Applicant has amended the claims in order to more clearly describe exemplary embodiments of a rail component. Nakao, on the other hand, is directed to a composition for gaskets. In view of the above arguments, the Applicant respectfully submits that Nakao in no way teaches or even suggests a rail component as set forth in the claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Nakao cannot support the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Conclusion

The Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22. Applicant has also distinguished the subject matter of the claimed invention over the teachings of the reference cited by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested. Telephone inquiry to the undersigned in order to clarify or otherwise expedite prosecution of the present application is respectfully encouraged.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 17, 2009

/Jeffrey C. Norris/

Jeffrey C. Norris  
Registration No. 42,039  
Standley Law Group LLP  
6300 Riverside Dr.  
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5043  
Telephone: (614) 792-5555  
Fax: (614) 792-5536  
E-mail: jnorris@standleyllp.com